

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER @001

NOV 04 2004

**FACSIMILE COVER PAGE  
(THIS COVER PAGE + 2 PAGES)**

**Today's Date: November 4, 2004**

**To: Examiner S. Tsegaye, Art Unit: 2662**

**FAX: (703) 872-9306**

**From: Frederick E. Cooperrider #36,769  
McGinn&Gibb, PLLC  
Ph: (703) 761-2377**

**In re Application of Osamu Kuboniwa**

**Serial No.: 09/450,768**

**Filed: November 30, 1999**

**For: ADSL SYSTEM**

**Contents: 1. Statement of Substance of Interview (2 pages)**

**CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION**

I certify that I transmitted via facsimile to (703) 872-9306 this Statement of Substance of Interview to Examiner S. Tsegaye on November 4, 2004.

  
Frederick E. Cooperrider  
Reg. No. 36,769

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

NOV 04 2004

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Osamu KUBONIWA

Serial No.: 09/450,768

Filed: Nov. 30, 1999

For: ADSL SYSTEM

Group Art Unit: 2662

Examiner: Tsegaye, Saba

Atty. Docket No. MA-385-US

Honorable Commissioner of Patents  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Sir:

In response to the requirement in 37 C.F.R. §1.2, 37 C.F.R. §1.133, and MPEP §713.04, that Applicants provide a statement of the substance of an interview, Applicant hereby submits the following summary.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges Examiner Tsegaye and Supervisory Examiner Pezzlo for taking time from their busy schedule to conduct a personal interview on October 27, 2004, for the above-referenced Application. The interview was courteous and professional, and it is believed by Applicant's representative that prosecution has been advanced because of this interview.

Concerning the substance of the interview, Applicant's representative presented a summary of the present invention as described, for example, by claim 1. The focus of the discussion was on the aspect of the present invention in which there is no intervening SONET transmission line such as taught in US Patent 6,141,339 to Kaplan et al.

The Examiners raised a concern that the current claim language does not definitely preclude the interpretation that the SONET line is present. Applicant's representative

Serial No. 09/450,768  
Docket No. MA-385-US  
Interview Summary

2

countered that the description in the claims of the After-Final Amendment filed on October 14, 2004, makes clear reference to a subscriber side apparatus and a station side apparatus interconnected by a subscriber line.

The Examiners maintained their position, and Applicant's representative agreed to provide a draft claim revision to Examiner Tsegaye to attempt to develop language acceptable to the Examiners that precludes the interpretation that the claims do not read on the SONET configuration of Kaplan.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/4/04

Frederick E. Cooperrider (703) 761-2377  
(Reg. No. 36,769)

**McGinn&Gibb, PLLC**  
Intellectual Property Law  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
Customer No. 21254

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**